Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. What Sinclair proposes to do is not an example of entertainment or news, it is an example of propoganda. Sinclair is not giving the individual stations the option of showing the 'documentary', they are forcing the individual stations to air the 'documentary'. They are not offering a balanced report, they are essentially airing an 'infomercial' as news. And because they own 62 stations, they can force their opinion on a mass market.

when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.